

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on June 30, 2008.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are amended. Claims 1-21 remain pending in this application.

Drawing Objections

In box 10 of the Office Action Summary, the Examiner noted that the drawings were filed on 27 January 2004, but the Examiner did not indicate in box 10a or 10b whether the drawings were formally accepted or objected to by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests clarification.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for anticipation by Royer (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,269).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other claim features, “a plurality of read strobe transceivers for transferring timing information of the output data and for transferring a second group of auxiliary information when the timing information of the input data and the first group of auxiliary information are transferred on the plurality of write strobe transceivers”. Applicant submits that amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated Royer, because Applicant is unable to find in Royer the above quoted claim feature.

The Office Action compares write strobe transceivers 131 and read strobe transceivers 141 in FIG. 1 of Royer to the plurality of write strobe transceivers and the plurality of read strobe transceivers, respectively, of claim 1. The Office Action also compares data information and timing information (e.g., data and timing in FIG. 2 through FIG. 4) of Royer to the timing information and auxiliary information, respectively, of claim 1. Applicant submits that the data information and timing information of Royer are different from the timing information and auxiliary information of claim 1.

Even if the data information and timing information of Royer can be comparable to the timing information and auxiliary information of claim 1, Royer lacks the above quoted feature of

claim 1. For example, as shown in FIG. 4 of Royer, write strobe transceivers 131 in FIG. 1 of Royer transfer write data information and timing information between times T0 and T1, and read strobe transceivers 141 in FIG. 1 of Royer transfer read data information and timing information between times T1 and T2, which is *after* times T0 and T1. Thus, in Royer, read strobe transceivers 141 *do not* transfer read data information and timing information between times T1 and T2 *when* write strobe transceivers 131 transfer write data information and timing information between times T0 and T1. In contrast, as quoted above, amended claim 1 recites “a plurality of read strobe transceivers for transferring timing information of the output data and for transferring a second group of auxiliary information when the timing information of the input data and the first group of auxiliary information are transferred on the plurality of write strobe transceivers”.

The reasons above show that Royer lacks the above quoted claim feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 1. Dependent claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1. Thus, for the same the reasons presented above regarding claim 1, plus the additional features recited in claims 6 and 7, these claims are also not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 6 and 7.

Amended independent claim 8 recites, among other claim features, the feature that is analogous to that of claim 1, such as “a plurality of read strobe transceivers for transferring timing information of the output data and for transferring a second group of auxiliary information when the timing information of the input data and the first group of auxiliary information are transferred on the plurality of write strobe transceivers”. Thus, for the same the reasons presented above regarding claim 1, Applicant is unable to find Royer the above quoted claim feature of claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 8. Dependent claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 8. Thus, for the same the reasons presented above regarding claim 8, plus the additional features recited in claims 13 and 14, these claims are also not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 13 and 14.

Amended independent claim 15 recites, among other claim features, the feature that is analogous to that of claim 1, such as “a plurality of read strobe transceivers for transferring timing information of the output data and for transferring a second group of auxiliary

information when the timing information of the input data and the first group of auxiliary information are transferred on the plurality of write strobe transceivers". Thus, for the same the reasons presented above regarding claim 1, Applicant is unable to find Royer the above quoted claim feature of claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 15. Dependent claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 15. Thus, for the same the reasons presented above regarding claim 15, plus the additional features recited in claims 20 and 21, these claims are also not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 20 and 21.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 2, 9, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royer in view of Nakagawa et al. (U.S. 6,798,367; hereinafter "Nakagawa").

Claims 3, 10, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royer in view of Nakagawa, further in view of Ergott, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,965,828; hereinafter "Ergott").

Claims 4, 11, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royer in view of Nakagawa and Ergott, further in view of Cooper et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0174559; hereinafter "Cooper").

Claims 5, 12, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royer in view of Nakagawa and Ergott and Cooper, further in view of Ware et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,594; hereinafter "Ware").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The above rejections of dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19 is based on Royer in combination with one or more of other art, such as Nakagawa, Ergott, Cooper, and Ware. However, none of Nakagawa, Ergott, Cooper, and Ware teaches the claim features (such as the quoted claim features above) of independent claims 1, 8, and 15 that is missing from Royer. Thus, Royer, Nakagawa, Ergott, Cooper, and Ware, whether they are considered singly or in any combination, lack the claim features of claims 1, 8, and 15 quoted above. Since dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19 depend from their respective independent claims 1, 8, and 15, dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19 are also patentable over Royer, Nakagawa, Ergott,

Cooper, and Ware for the same reasons presented above regarding claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19, plus the additional features recited in claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19 are patentable over Royer, Nakagawa, Ergott, Cooper, and Ware for the following reasons.

Statement of Common Ownership

The present application and Royer (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,269) were, at the time the invention of the present application was made, commonly owned by Micron Technology, Inc.

Applicant submits that Royer may be is unavailable as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) because the reference constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), *see* MPEP § 706.02(1)(1) and § 706.02(1)(2) for examples. Applicant submits that Royer is unavailable as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) because the reference constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Since the Royer reference is unavailable as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicant submits that claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19 are patentable because Nakagawa, Ergott, Cooper, and Ware, whether they are considered individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claim features that are missing from Royer.

Based on all of the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date

9-30-08

By



Viet V. Tong
Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 30th day of September, 2008.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

